

7th February 1925]

A.—(a) Subsidiary rules to the Fundamental Rules were issued by the Local Government on the 6th November 1922. The Fundamental Rules came into force with effect from 1st January 1922.

(b) There have been some changes. They were made by the Secretary of State in Council under the powers conferred by section 96-B of the Government of India Act.

(c) Yes.

(d) Yes.

(e) When Rule 81 was amended, Government servants who had elected to come under the Fundamental Rules were again allowed the option of reverting to the leave rules by which they were previously governed.

(f) The amendment of Fundamental Rule 81 was introduced to correct a mistake that had been overlooked when the rules were originally issued. The Government are unaware of the reasons for the recent amendment of Fundamental Rule 87.

Village Establishments.

Duties of village servants, talaiyaris, etc.

* 207 Q.—Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the village servants, talaiyaris and vettians are bound to serve both the village munsif and the karnam;

(b) whether they are under the control of both of them; and

(c) if so, how their services are divided between the two officers?

A.—(a) & (b) The vetti and talaiyari are under the control of the head of the village. They must obey the karnam if deputed for work under him.

(c) Subject to any orders of competent superior authority, this is a matter for the headman to arrange with due regard to the needs of the village.

Mr. R. SRINIVASAN:—“Referring to answer (c) where it is stated ‘to arrange with due regard to the needs of the village,’ may I know whether it includes sanitary arrangements also?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS:—“I want notice of that question.”

Village munsifs in the Tinnevelly district.

* 208 Q.—Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that all the Nadar village munsifs have lost their seats during the revision of villages in the Tinnevelly district;

(b) whether any petition concerning the matter has been submitted to the Government; and

(c) if so, whether the Government have taken any action on the petition?

A.—(a) The Government have no reason to think so.

(b) & (c) No such petition has been received.

[7th February 1925]

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—“With reference to clause (a), will the Government be pleased to make an enquiry into the matter?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“I do not think there is any necessity to make any special enquiry having regard to the proposal to revive the officers to certain extent.”

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—“May I know when this revival will take place?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“As soon as it is practicable to get through the legislation for that purpose.”

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—“May I know whether the same old officers will be restored?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“I cannot guarantee that.”

Mr. A. CHIDAMBARA NADAR :—“In such a case, is it not necessary to make an enquiry and see whether the Nadar village munsifs are excluded?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“Under the circumstances stated I do not think so, Sir.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“May I know whether the Bill is ready for introduction?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“It is almost ready.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“What is the proposal with reference to these officers?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“How does that arise out of this question, Sir?”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“The hon. Member said that the Bill is ready, or almost ready for introduction. Certainly Government ought to know their proposals, whether they are going to reinstate the old officers or appoint new men for the villages?”

The hon. Mr. N. E. MARJORIBANKS :—“I have nothing to add to my former answer.”

Local Boards and Municipal Councils.

Manner of election of members of taluk boards to district boards.

* 209 Q.—Mr. K. RAGHUCHANDRA BALLAL: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) (i) whether the rules framed under the Local Boards Act of 1920 and revised under G.O. Notification of May 1921 are obligatory on the presidents of taluk boards in the matter of electing members of such boards to the district boards;

(ii) whether presidents of taluk boards are not bound to report fully to the Government or any other authority as to the manner in which such elections are held while reporting the results;

(b) (i) whether the Government are aware that on 26th November 1924 the President of the Mangalore Taluk Board held an election to elect two members from the said board to the District Board of South Kanara;